

January 19, 2010

Nambu Bracket for M Theory

Pei-Ming Ho^{†1},

[†] *Department of Physics, Center for Theoretical Sciences
and Leung Center for Cosmology and Particle Astrophysics,
National Taiwan University, Taipei 10617, Taiwan, R.O.C.*

Abstract

In this article we give a concise review of recent progress in our understanding of the Lie 3-algebra and their application to the Bagger-Lambert-Gustavsson model describing multiple M2-branes in M theory.

¹E-mail address: pmho@phys.ntu.edu.tw

1 Introduction

In 1973, Nambu [1] proposed an alternative to the canonical formulation. In the canonical formulation, the equations of motion (Hamilton-Jacobi equations) of a physical system are defined via a Poisson bracket and a Hamiltonian. In Nambu's formulation, the Poisson bracket is replaced by the Nambu bracket. The latter differs from the former by having 3 slots instead of 2. In general, for an algebra $\mathcal{A}$, a Nambu bracket is a skew-symmetric tri-linear map $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. In Nambu's original paper [1], he considered imposing various properties on the bracket for various applications. It was not totally clear then, or now, which are the properties one should impose on the Nambu bracket for a certain application.

Later, Takhtajan [2] defined a special class of Nambu brackets, called the Nambu-Poisson brackets (See Sec. 2.4). He found a class of 2 dimensional (string) systems for which the Nambu-Poisson bracket can be used to write down the equations of motion (together with 2 Hamiltonians) with the advantage that a larger symmetry is kept manifest compared with the canonical formulation, which requires a gauge fixing condition.

More recently, Bagger, Lambert [3–5] and Gustavsson [6] proposed a model to describe the system of multiple M2-branes in M theory. The model is defined on a Lie 3-algebra, which is equipped with a Nambu bracket that satisfies a generalized Jacobi identity. The purpose of this article is to give a concise review of recent advances in understanding the Lie 3-algebra and the BLG model.

2 Mathematical Aspects

2.1 Lie 3-algebra

Lie n -algebra, also known as n -ary Lie algebra, or Filippov n -algebra [7], is a natural generalization of Lie algebra. For a linear space $\mathcal{V} = \{\sum_{a=1}^N v_a T_a; v_a \in \mathbb{C}\}$ of dimension N , a Lie n -algebra structure is defined by a multilinear map (an n -bracket) $[\cdot, \dots, \cdot] : \mathcal{V}^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ satisfying the following properties

1. *Skew-symmetry:*

For arbitrary $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{V}$,

$$[A_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, A_{\sigma(n)}] = (-1)^{|\sigma|} [A_1, \dots, A_n], \quad (1)$$

where σ is a permutation of the set $(1, 2, \dots, n)$ and $(-1)^{|\sigma|}$ denotes the signature of permutation.

2. *Fundamental identity (or Generalized Jacobi Identity):*

For arbitrary $A_1, \dots, A_{n-1}, B_1, \dots, B_n \in \mathcal{V}$,

$$[A_1, \dots, A_{n-1}, [B_1, \dots, B_n]] = \sum_{k=1}^n [B_1, \dots, B_{k-1}, [A_1, \dots, A_{n-1}, B_k], B_{k+1}, \dots, B_n]. \quad (2)$$

Let us now focus on the case of Lie 3-algebra. There are two ways to understand the significance of the fundamental identity.

First, if we define a transformation on the elements of a Lie 3-algebra ¹

$$\delta_\Lambda A = \Lambda_{ab}[T_a, T_b, A], \quad \Lambda \equiv \Lambda_{ab}(T_a \wedge T_b), \quad (4)$$

where Λ_{ab} are the transformation parameters, the fundamental identity is equivalent to the statement that the 3-bracket (or *Nambu bracket*) is covariant, i.e.,

$$\delta_\Lambda[A, B, C] = [\delta_\Lambda A, B, C] + [A, \delta_\Lambda B, C] + [A, B, \delta_\Lambda C]. \quad (5)$$

The transformations δ_Λ in (4) can be understood as generators of a Lie algebra. The fundamental identity is also equivalent to the statement that the Lie bracket of the transformations is given by

$$[\delta_{\Lambda_1}, \delta_{\Lambda_2}] = \delta_{\Lambda_3}, \quad (6)$$

where

$$\Lambda_3 = (\Lambda_1)_{ab}(\Lambda_2)_{cd}([T_a, T_b, T_c] \wedge T_d + T_c \wedge [T_a, T_b, T_d]). \quad (7)$$

Therefore, the 3-bracket can be used to define symmetry transformations in a physical model, and it can also be used to construct a covariant object from 3 covariant quantities that transforms like (4).

According to the definition above, a usual Lie algebra is also a Lie 2-algebra. In physical applications, it is often convenient to realize a Lie algebra via a representation, which is a map $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow M_k$, where M_k is the space of $k \times k$ matrices. Given a representation, the Lie bracket can be realized as the commutator

$$\mathcal{R}([A, B]) = \mathcal{R}(A)\mathcal{R}(B) - \mathcal{R}(B)\mathcal{R}(A). \quad (8)$$

We also know how to construct (or decompose) representations from (or into) irreducible representations. For a Lie 3-algebra, a representation can be defined as a map from $\mathcal{V} \wedge \mathcal{V}$ to M_k . It is obvious that this can be done, as δ_Λ defined in (4) can be understood as a Lie algebra generator, and $\Lambda \in \mathcal{V} \wedge \mathcal{V}$. However, the drastic difference between Lie algebra and Lie 3-algebra is that a matrix representation for Lie algebra automatically guarantees the Jacobi identity to be satisfied, thus one can easily construct Lie algebras from the algebra of a set of matrices. This ensures the existence of plenty of Lie algebras. On the other hand, no representation of the Lie 3-algebra implies the validity of the fundamental identity, and it is hence much harder to construct new examples of Lie 3-algebras. This is probably one of the greatest obstacles that hinder the application of Lie 3-algebra to physics.

In terms of a basis $\{T_a\}$, a Lie 3-algebra is defined by the structure constants $f_{abc}{}^d$:

$$[T_a, T_b, T_c] = f_{abc}{}^d T_d. \quad (9)$$

The fundamental identity implies a bilinear relation among the structure constants,

$$f_{b_1 b_2 b_3}{}^c f_{a_1 a_2 c}{}^d = f_{a_1 a_2 b_1}{}^c f_{c b_2 b_3}{}^d + f_{a_1 a_2 b_2}{}^c f_{b_1 c b_3}{}^d + f_{a_1 a_2 b_3}{}^c f_{b_1 b_2 c}{}^d. \quad (10)$$

Analogous to the Killing form in Lie algebra, it is often necessary for physical applications that the Lie 3-algebra be equipped with a metric

$$\langle T_a | T_b \rangle = h_{ab} \quad (11)$$

¹Here $\wedge$ denotes the antisymmetrized tensor product, i.e.,

$$A \wedge B \equiv \frac{1}{2}(A \otimes B - B \otimes A). \quad (3)$$

which is invariant under the transformations (4). That is,

$$\langle \delta_\Lambda A | B \rangle + \langle A | \delta_\Lambda B \rangle = 0. \quad (12)$$

This implies a relation for the structure constants

$$f_{a_1 a_2 b}{}^d h_{dc} + f_{a_1 a_2 c}{}^d h_{db} = 0. \quad (13)$$

As $f_{a_1 a_2 a_3}{}^b$ is antisymmetrized in its subscripts due to the skew-symmetry of the 3-bracket, the tensor

$$f_{a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4} \equiv f_{a_1 a_2 a_3}{}^b h_{ba_4} \quad (14)$$

is totally antisymmetrized.

2.2 $\mathcal{A}_4$

The simplest nontrivial Lie 3-algebra is $\mathcal{A}_4$. It has 4 generators $\{T_a\}_{a=1}^4$. The Nambu bracket is defined by

$$[T_a, T_b, T_c] = \epsilon_{abcd} T_d, \quad (15)$$

where ϵ_{abcd} is the totally antisymmetrized tensor with $\epsilon_{1234} = 1$. The invariant metric of $\mathcal{A}_4$ is

$$\langle T_a | T_b \rangle = \delta_{ab}. \quad (16)$$

$\mathcal{A}_4$ is obviously a natural generalization of the Lie algebra $su(2)$.

$\mathcal{A}_4$ was named the “generalized spin algebra” in [9], where representations of $\mathcal{A}_4$ in terms of matrices and cubic matrices [10] were constructed.² The matrix representations in [9] have the peculiar feature [11] that one of the generators is proportional to the identity matrix. There is therefore some motivation to explore the possibility of using cubic matrices to represent Lie 3-algebras. However, the cubic matrix representations do not fulfill the requirement of fundamental identity automatically, and it is not clear whether cubic matrix representations exist for all Lie 3-algebras.

It was conjectured in [11] and later proved in [12] that the only finite dimensional Lie 3-algebras with a positive-definite metric are the trivial algebra, $\mathcal{A}_4$, and their direct sums.³ On the other hand, it is possible to define many infinite dimensional Lie 3-algebras with positive-definite metrics. All the Nambu-Poisson algebras are of this kind.

2.3 Lie 3-Alebras with Non-Positive-Definite Metric

As we mentioned above, finite dimensional Lie 3-algebras are either just copies of $\mathcal{A}_4$ with a trivial algebra, or their metrics are not positive-definite. Thus we are forced to consider Lie 3-algebra metrics with non-positive-definite signatures.

Readers who are interested in learning mathematical issues such as how these Lie 3-algebras are systematically constructed, how general or unique they are, etc. are directed to the literature [14, 15].

²Cubic matrix representations of $\mathcal{A}_4$ were also given in [11].

³Similar conjectures were also proposed and studied in [13].

A Lie 3-algebra with generators $\{u_a, e_i\}$ ($a, b, c = 1, 2, \dots, M$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$) can be defined by [16]

$$[u_a, u_b, u_c] = K_{abc}^i e_i + L_{abcd} v^d, \quad (17)$$

$$[u_a, u_b, e^i] = J_{ab}^{ij} e_j - K_{abc}^i v^c, \quad (18)$$

$$[u_a, e^i, e^j] = J_{ab}^{ij} v^b + f_a^{ijk} e_k, \quad (19)$$

$$[e^i, e^j, e^k] = -f_a^{ijk} v^a. \quad (20)$$

The constant coefficients K_{abc}^i , L_{abcd} , J_{ab} and f_a^{ijk} are defined as follows.

First, the range $I \equiv \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ of the indices i, j, k is divided into n disjoint sets $I = I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \dots \cup I_n$, corresponding to n Lie algebras $\mathbf{g}_a$ with structure constants f_a^{ijk} and Killing form g_a^{ij} (which is used to raise and lower indices on e_i and e^i). We have

$$f_a^{ijk} = \begin{cases} f_a^{ijk}, & i, j, k \in I_a, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

$$J_{ab}^{ij} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}_{ab}(e^i), & \text{both } i, j \in I_a \text{ or both } i, j \in I_b, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

$$K_{abc}^i = \begin{cases} [\mathcal{D}_{ac}, \mathcal{D}_{bc}] + [\mathcal{D}_{ba}, \mathcal{D}_{ca}] + [\mathcal{D}_{cb}, \mathcal{D}_{ab}] + C_{abc}, & i \in I_a \cup I_b \cup I_c, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

where $\mathcal{D}_{ab}$ is a derivative of $\mathbf{g}_a \oplus \mathbf{g}_b$, and $C_{abc} = C_{abc}^i e_i$ is restricted to be a central element in the Lie algebras $\mathbf{g}_a \oplus \mathbf{g}_b \oplus \mathbf{g}_c$ such that

$$\mathcal{D}_{ab}(C_{acd}) + \mathcal{D}_{ac}(C_{adb}) + \mathcal{D}_{ad}(C_{abc}) = 0. \quad (24)$$

Let us recall that a derivative $\mathcal{D}$ of a Lie algebra satisfies the relation

$$\mathcal{D}([e^i, e^j]) = [\mathcal{D}(e^i), e^j] + [e^i, \mathcal{D}(e^j)]. \quad (25)$$

Due to the Jacobi identity, any Lie algebra element $h = h^i e_i$ defines a derivative

$$\mathcal{D}_h(e^i) \equiv [h, e^i]. \quad (26)$$

They are called inner derivatives. It turns out that if $\mathcal{D}_{ab}$ is an inner derivative, one can always carry out a change of basis on the generators $\{u_a, e^i\}$ such that J_{ab}^{ij} vanishes for the new basis [16]. Hence we only need to consider the cases when $\mathcal{D}_{ab}$'s are outer derivatives.

The nontrivial part of the invariant metric is given by

$$\langle e^i | e^j \rangle = g_a^{ij} \quad \text{if } i, j \in I_a, \quad (27)$$

$$\langle u_a | v^b \rangle = \delta_a^b, \quad (28)$$

where g_a^{ij} is the Killing form of the Lie algebra $\mathbf{g}_a$. Even if g_a^{ij} for all $a = 1, 2, \dots, n$ are positive-definite, the Lie 3-algebra has n negative-norm elements $(u_a - v^a)/\sqrt{2}$.

In [15] a slightly more general Lie 3-algebra was constructed. However, the difference does not lead to physically new configurations through the BLD model.

2.3.1 Example: $M = 1$

The simplest nontrivial example of the construction above is the following.

For any given Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ with generators e^i , structure constants f^{ij}_k and Killing form g^{ij} , one can adjoin two new generators u_0, v^0 ⁴ and construct a Lie 3-algebra defined by the following Lie 3-brackets [18–20]

$$[u_0, e^i, e^j] = f^{ij}_k e^k, \quad (29)$$

$$[e^i, e^j, e^k] = -f^{ijk} v^0, \quad (30)$$

and invariant metric

$$\langle u_0 | v^0 \rangle = 1, \quad \langle e^i | e^j \rangle = g^{ij}. \quad (31)$$

This Lie 3-algebra was discovered before the more general algebra constructed above in [18–20], and applied to the BLG model to describe D2-branes.

2.3.2 Example: $M > 1$

As a more complicated example, we start with the Lie algebra with generators $\{T_{\vec{m}}^a\}$ ($a = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\otimes d}$),⁵ where $\vec{m}$ is a d -dimensional vector with integer components. The Lie bracket is assumed to be of this form

$$[T_{\vec{m}}^i, T_{\vec{n}}^j] = f^{ij}_k e^{i\theta^{ab} m_a n_b} T_{\vec{m}+\vec{n}}^k, \quad (32)$$

where f^{ij}_k is the structure constant of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\theta^{ab} = -\theta^{ba}$ ($a, b = 1, 2, \dots, d$) is a constant antisymmetric matrix.

The subscripts $\vec{m}$ on the generators $T_{\vec{m}}^a$ allow us to define a derivative

$$\mathcal{D}_{0a}(T_{\vec{m}}^i) = m_a T_{\vec{m}}^i, \quad a = 1, 2, \dots, d. \quad (33)$$

To construct the Lie 3-algebra as described above, we choose the range of indices $I = \{(i, \vec{m})\}$ to be $I = I_0$, that is, we choose $I_1, \dots, I_d$ to be empty sets. Then we have [16]

$$f_0^{(i\vec{l})(j\vec{m})(k\vec{n})} = f^{ijk} e^{i\theta^{ab} l_a m_b} \delta^{(3)}(\vec{l} + \vec{m} + \vec{n}), \quad (34)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{ab}(T_{\vec{m}}^i) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}_{0a}(T_{\vec{m}}^i) = m_a T_{\vec{m}}^i, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

$$K_{abc}^i e^i = \begin{cases} K_{0ab} = C_{0ab}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

with the metric

$$\langle u_a | v^b \rangle = \delta_a^b, \quad \langle T_{\vec{m}}^i | T_{\vec{n}}^j \rangle = g^{ij} \delta^{(d)}(\vec{m} + \vec{n}), \quad (37)$$

where g^{ij} is the Killing form for $\mathfrak{g}$. C_{0ab} are arbitrary central elements in $\mathfrak{g}$.

It turns out that the Lie 3-algebra defined this way is the same as the Lie 3-algebra obtained from the Kac-Moody algebra generated by $\{T_{\vec{m}}^i, D_a\}$ through the construction of Sec. 2.3.1 [16].

⁴We used a different notation here from the above. Otherwise (u_0, v^0) should be denoted (u_1, v^1) .

⁵Despite the fact that our motivation to consider Lie 3-algebras with non-positive-definite metrics was to construct finite dimensional Lie 3-algebras, the construction above also applies to infinite dimensional cases.

We can view the generators $T_{\vec{m}}^i$ as

$$T_{\vec{m}}^i = T^i e^{i\vec{m} \cdot \vec{x}} \quad (38)$$

where T^i 's are the generators of a Lie algebra with structure constants f^{ij}_k , and $e^{i\vec{m} \cdot \vec{x}}$ is the Fourier basis of functions on a d -dimensional noncommutative torus with the noncommutativity matrix θ^{ab} . The construction of the Lie 3-algebra also applies to the case when functions (sections on the trivial bundle) are replaced by sections of twisted bundles [16].

2.4 Nambu-Poisson Algebra

A Nambu-Poisson algebra is a Lie 3-algebra of functions on a manifold $\mathcal{M}$ that satisfies, in addition to the skew symmetry and fundamental identity, the Leibniz rule

$$\{f_1 f_2, g, h\} = f_1 \{f_2, g, h\} + f_2 \{f_1, g, h\} \quad (39)$$

for arbitrary functions f_1, f_2, g, h on $\mathcal{M}$. Here we use the braces $\{\cdot, \cdot, \cdot\}$ to denote the Lie 3-bracket, which is called the Nambu-Poisson bracket. Apparently the Nambu-Poisson structure is a natural generalization of the Poisson structure.

The decomposition theorem [21] states that locally it is always possible to choose coordinates on $\mathcal{M}$ such that

$$\{f, g, h\} = \epsilon_{ijk} \partial_i f \partial_j g \partial_k h, \quad i, j, k = 1, 2, 3. \quad (40)$$

That is, only the first 3 coordinates x^1, x^2, x^3 on a local patch of $\mathcal{M}$ are relevant to the Nambu bracket. This theorem is analogous to, but much more restrictive than the Darboux theorem for the Poisson algebra. The decomposibility theorem can be interpreted as the mathematical reason why there are no solitonic branes other than 5-branes in M theory.

The metric of the Nambu-Poisson algebra can often be defined by the integration on the d dimensional manifold $\mathcal{M}$ with a suitable measure μ

$$\langle f | g \rangle = \int d^d x \mu(x) f(x) g(x). \quad (41)$$

The simplest example of Nambu-Poisson algebra is for $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^3$ or T^3 with the Nambu-Poisson bracket defined by (40) with the Cartesian coordinates x_1, x_2, x_3 . The metric can be defined by the integration as in (41) with $\mu(x) = 1$. This Nambu-Poisson algebra is an infinite dimensional Lie 3-algebra with a positive-definite metric.

2.5 Lorentzian Extension of Nambu-Poisson Algebra

A Nambu-Poisson algebra can have a central extension. To illustrate this idea, we consider the Nambu-Poisson algebra on the 3D torus T^3 . Let us take the Fourier modes as the basis of functions

$$\chi^{\vec{n}} = e^{2\pi i n^a x_a}, \quad (42)$$

where x_a are the Cartesian coordinates on T^3 with the equivalence relations

$$x_a \sim x_a + m_a, \quad m_a \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (43)$$

The Nambu-Poisson bracket on T^3 can be defined as

$$[\chi^{\vec{l}}, \chi^{\vec{m}}, \chi^{\vec{n}}] = (2\pi i)^3 \epsilon_{abc} l^a m^b n^c \chi^{\vec{l}+\vec{m}+\vec{n}}, \quad (44)$$

with the invariant metric

$$\langle \chi^{\vec{m}} | \chi^{\vec{n}} \rangle = \delta^{(3)}(\vec{m} + \vec{n}). \quad (45)$$

Adjoining new algebraic elements u_a , v^a ($a = 1, 2, 3$) to the Nambu-Poisson algebra, we define a Lie 3-algebra with the following Lie 3-brackets [16]

$$[\chi^{\vec{l}}, \chi^{\vec{m}}, \chi^{\vec{n}}] = (2\pi i)^3 \epsilon_{abc} l^a m^b n^c \chi^{\vec{l}+\vec{m}+\vec{n}} - (2\pi i)^2 \epsilon_{abc} \delta^{(3)}(\vec{l} + \vec{m} + \vec{n}) l^a m^b v^c, \quad (46)$$

$$[u_a, \chi^{\vec{m}}, \chi^{\vec{n}}] = (2\pi i)^2 \epsilon_{abc} m^b n^c \chi^{\vec{m}+\vec{n}} - (2\pi i) \epsilon_{abc} \delta^{(3)}(\vec{m} + \vec{n}) m^b v^c, \quad (47)$$

$$[u_a, u_b, \chi^{\vec{n}}] = (2\pi i) \epsilon_{abc} n^c \chi^{\vec{n}} - \epsilon_{abc} \delta^{(3)}(\vec{n}) v^c, \quad (48)$$

$$[u_a, u_b, u_c] = \epsilon_{abc}. \quad (49)$$

The new invariant metric has

$$\langle \chi^{\vec{m}} | \chi^{\vec{n}} \rangle = \delta^{(3)}(\vec{m} + \vec{n}), \quad \langle u_a | v^b \rangle = \delta_a^b, \quad (50)$$

with other components vanishing.

By definition, the elements v^a are central, that is, the 3-brackets of v^a with any two other elements vanish. If we set $v^a = 0$, the Lie 3-algebra is the same as the original Nambu-Poisson algebra with u_a identified with the Cartesian coordinates x_a .

3 Application to M Theory

In M theory, the fundamental ingredients are the M2-branes (or membranes). M5-branes are their solitonic electric-magnetic dual. The action describing a single M2-brane [22] and the action for a single M5-brane [23, 24] are known for a long time. However, the action for multiple M5-branes is still unknown, and the action describing multiple M2-branes was proposed [3–5] only recently. It remains to be seen whether this Bagger-Lambert-Gustavsson (BLG) model of multiple membranes will survive all the tests of validity. In the following we will summarize supporting evidences for the BLG model as well as challenges to its full success.

3.1 Bagger-Lambert Action

Bagger and Lambert [3–5] proposed a supersymmetric Lagrangian for a given Lie 3-algebra as

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2} \langle D^\mu X^I | D_\mu X^I \rangle + \frac{i}{2} \langle \bar{\Psi} | \Gamma^\mu D_\mu \Psi \rangle + \frac{i}{4} \langle \bar{\Psi} | \Gamma_{IJ} [X^I, X^J, \Psi] \rangle - V(X) + \mathcal{L}_{CS}, \quad (51)$$

where $\mu = 0, 1, 2$, $I, J, K = 1, 2, \dots, 8$. In the above, Ψ is an 11D Majorana spinor satisfying the chirality condition

$$\Gamma_{012} \Psi = -\Psi, \quad (52)$$

D_μ is the covariant derivative

$$(D_\mu \Phi)_a = \partial_\mu \Phi_a - f^{cd}{}_a A_{\mu cd}(x) \Phi_b, \quad (\Phi = X^I, \Psi) \quad (53)$$

and $V(X)$ is the potential term defined by

$$V(X) = \frac{1}{12} \langle [X^I, X^J, X^K] | [X^I, X^J, X^K] \rangle. \quad (54)$$

Finally the Chern-Simons action for the gauge potential is

$$\mathcal{L}_{CS} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} \left(f^{abcd} A_{\mu ab} \partial_\nu A_{\lambda cd} + \frac{2}{3} f^{cda}{}_g f^{efgb} A_{\mu ab} A_{\nu cd} A_{\lambda ef} \right). \quad (55)$$

The SUSY transformation is defined by

$$\delta X_a^I = i\bar{\epsilon} \Gamma^I \Psi_a, \quad (56)$$

$$\delta \Psi_a = D_\mu X_a^I \Gamma^\mu \Gamma^I \epsilon - \frac{1}{6} X_b^I X_c^J X_d^K f^{bcd}{}_a \Gamma^{IJK} \epsilon, \quad (57)$$

$$\delta \tilde{A}_\mu{}^b{}_a = i\bar{\epsilon} \Gamma_\mu \Gamma_I X_c^I \Psi_d f^{cdb}{}_a, \quad (58)$$

where

$$\Gamma_{012} \epsilon = \epsilon, \quad \tilde{A}_\mu{}^b{}_a \equiv A_{\mu cd} f^{cdb}{}_a. \quad (59)$$

The gauge transformation rule is defined as

$$\delta X_a^I = \tilde{\Lambda}^b{}_a X_b^I, \quad \delta \tilde{A}_\mu{}^b{}_a = \partial_\mu \tilde{\Lambda}^b{}_a - \tilde{\Lambda}^b{}_c \tilde{A}_\mu{}^c{}_a + \tilde{A}_\mu{}^b{}_c \tilde{\Lambda}^c{}_a. \quad (60)$$

The fermion Ψ transforms like X^I .

While the fundamental identity is needed for the gauge symmetry of the multiple M2-brane theory, the invariant metric is also necessary to write down the gauge-invariant Lagrangian.

3.2 Successes

In the following we summarize examples of how different choices of Lie 3-algebras change the physical interpretation of the Bagger-Lambert action.

- **M2 on M-fold**

The BL action based on the Lie 3-algebra $\mathcal{A}_4$ defined in Sec. 2.2 turned out to describe 2 M2-branes on an M-fold [17].

- **M2 to D2**

The Lie 3-algebra defined in Sec. 2.3.1 was applied to the Bagger-Lambert action in [18–20]. After integrating out auxiliary fields and field redefinitions, it was shown [20] that the BL action precisely turns into the Super Yang-Mills action for D2-branes.

- **M2 to Dp**

Plugging the Lie 3-algebra defined in Sec. 2.3.2 into the BL action gives the super Yang-Mills theory for Dp-branes for $p = d + 2$.

- **M2 to M5**

If we take the Nambu-Poisson algebra with Lorentzian extension in Sec. 2.5 as the Lie 3-algebra⁶ in the BLG model, the BL action becomes a 6D theory with a self-dual 2-form gauge potential

⁶Actually, in [25, 26] we considered the Nambu-Poisson algebra without central extension but took a nontrivial background configuration. It was realized in [16] that this is equivalent to taking the Lorentzian extension of Nambu-Poisson bracket with a trivial background.

which should be identified with the M5-brane worldvolume theory in a large constant C -field background [25, 26].⁷

3.3 Challenges

The Bagger-Lambert action was proposed to describe a system of multiple M2-branes. This proposal suffers the following problems.

- There are not so many Lie 3-algebras. The only nontrivial finite dimensional Lie 3-algebra with a positive-definite metric is $\mathcal{A}_4$. The only other known example of Lie 3-algebra with a positive-definite metric is the Nambu-Poisson algebra. The fundamental identity is found to be a very strong constraint that severely limits the existence of Lie 3-algebras. At the same time, we do not have a general theory about how to construct Lie 3-algebras, or enough examples for physically interesting configurations.
- We do not have a good intuition about the connection between algebraic properties of a Lie 3-algebra and physical degrees of freedom of M2-branes. In contrast, we can identify open string degrees of freedom in the super Yang-Mills gauge theory describing multiple Dp -branes. As a result, we know how to construct Dp -brane worldvolume theories living on an orbifold or orientifold. On the other hand, the background configuration corresponding to a given Lie 3-algebra is often not clear before lengthy algebraic manipulations. This may be related to the fact that we do not have a “suitable” representation theory for the Lie 3-algebra.

More specifically, we do not know how to construct Lie 3-algebras such that the BLG model describes

- N M2-branes in flat, uncompactified, 11D spacetime.
- N M2-branes in an M-fold other than the case described by $\mathcal{A}_4$.
- a single M5-brane in finite C field background, so that upon double dimension reduction it reduces to the noncommutative super Yang-Mills theory for a D4-brane.
- multiple M5-branes.

These are the some of the most important topics for future study. Whether the BLG model will become a successful model of multiple M2-branes depends on whether these problems will be solved. Let me conclude the paper by mentioning that there is a different route to describing multiple M2-branes via the ABJM model [28]. ABJM theory was first expressed as a theory of $N \times N$ matrices, but it can also be rewritten as a BLG-type theory with the Lie 3-algebra replaced by another type of 3-algebra which leads to a smaller ($\mathcal{N} = 6$) supersymmetry [29]. The advantage of the ABJM model is that it is capable of describing an arbitrary number of M2-branes; its disadvantage is that part of the supersymmetry of the M2-brane system is not manifest. Another advantage of the BLG model over the ABJM model is that the former allows the realization of an M5-brane in a C -field background in terms of infinitely many M2-branes via the Nambu-Poisson algebra [25, 26], while this can be done for the ABJM model only for particular curved (non-BPS) M5-branes [30].

⁷A hint about the connection between the Nambu-Poisson bracket and the M5-brane worldvolume theory in the C -field background was obtained earlier from a study of open membrane scattering amplitude [27].

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Chong-Sun Chu, José Figueroa-O’Farrill, Yutaka Matuso, Yosuke Imamura and Shotaro Shiba for discussions. This work is supported in part by the National Science Council, and the National Center for Theoretical Sciences, Taiwan, R.O.C.

References

- [1] Y. Nambu, “Generalized Hamiltonian dynamics,” *Phys. Rev. D* **7**, 2405 (1973).
- [2] L. Takhtajan, “On Foundation Of The Generalized Nambu Mechanics (Second Version),” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **160**, 295 (1994) [arXiv:hep-th/9301111].
- [3] J. Bagger and N. Lambert, “Modeling multiple M2’s,” *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 045020 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0611108].
- [4] J. Bagger and N. Lambert, “Gauge Symmetry and Supersymmetry of Multiple M2-Branes,” *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 065008 (2008) [arXiv:0711.0955 [hep-th]].
- [5] J. Bagger and N. Lambert, “Comments On Multiple M2-branes,” *JHEP* **0802**, 105 (2008) [arXiv:0712.3738 [hep-th]].
- [6] A. Gustavsson, “Algebraic structures on parallel M2-branes,” arXiv:0709.1260 [hep-th].
- [7] V. T. Filippov, “n-Lie algebras,” *Sib. Mat. Zh.*, 26, No. 6, 126140 (1985).
- [8] Sh. M. Kasymov, “Theory of n-lie algebras”, *Algebra and Logic* **26**, No.3, 155-166 (1987), translated from *Algebra i Logika*, **26**, No. 3, 277297 (1987).
- [9] Y. Kawamura, “Cubic matrix, generalized spin algebra and uncertainty relation,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **110**, 579 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0304149].
- [10] Y. Kawamura, “Cubic matrix, Nambu mechanics and beyond,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **109**, 153 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0207054].
- [11] P.-M. Ho, R.-C. Hou and Y. Matsuo, “Lie 3-Algebra and Multiple M2-branes,” *JHEP* **0806** (2008) 020, [arXiv:0804.2110 [hep-th]].
- [12] J. P. Gauntlett and J. B. Gutowski, “Constraining Maximally Supersymmetric Membrane Actions,” arXiv:0804.3078 [hep-th]; G. Papadopoulos, “M2-branes, 3-Lie Algebras and Plucker relations,” *JHEP* **0805**, 054 (2008) [arXiv:0804.2662 [hep-th]].
- [13] J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill and G. Papadopoulos, “Pluecker-type relations for orthogonal planes,” arXiv:math/0211170.
- [14] P. De Medeiros, J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill and E. Mendez-Escobar, “Lorentzian Lie 3-algebras and their Bagger-Lambert moduli space,” *JHEP* **0807**, 111 (2008) [arXiv:0805.4363 [hep-th]]; J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill, “Lorentzian Lie n-algebras,” *J. Math. Phys.* **49**, 113509 (2008) [arXiv:0805.4760 [math.RT]]; P. de Medeiros, J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill and E. Mendez-Escobar,

- “Metric Lie 3-algebras in Bagger-Lambert theory,” JHEP **0808**, 045 (2008) [arXiv:0806.3242 [hep-th]]; J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill, “Metric Lie n-algebras and double extensions,” arXiv:0806.3534 [math.RT]; P. de Medeiros, J. Figueroa-O’Farrill, E. Mendez-Escobar and P. Ritter, “On the Lie-algebraic origin of metric 3-algebras,” Commun. Math. Phys. **290**, 871 (2009) [arXiv:0809.1086 [hep-th]]; J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill, “Three lectures on 3-algebras,” arXiv:0812.2865 [hep-th].
- [15] P. de Medeiros, J. Figueroa-O’Farrill, E. Mendez-Escobar and P. Ritter, “Metric 3-Lie algebras for unitary Bagger-Lambert theories,” JHEP **0904**, 037 (2009) [arXiv:0902.4674 [hep-th]].
- [16] P. M. Ho, Y. Matsuo and S. Shiba, “Lorentzian Lie (3-)algebra and toroidal compactification of M/string theory,” JHEP **0903**, 045 (2009) [arXiv:0901.2003 [hep-th]].
- [17] N. Lambert and D. Tong, “Membranes on an Orbifold,” arXiv:0804.1114 [hep-th]; J. Distler, S. Mukhi, C. Papageorgakis and M. Van Raamsdonk, “M2-branes on M-folds,” arXiv:0804.1256 [hep-th].
- [18] J. Gomis, G. Milanesi and J. G. Russo, “Bagger-Lambert Theory for General Lie Algebras,” JHEP **0806** (2008) 075, [arXiv:0805.1012 [hep-th]].
- [19] S. Benvenuti, D. Rodriguez-Gomez, E. Tonni and H. Verlinde, “N=8 superconformal gauge theories and M2 branes,” arXiv:0805.1087 [hep-th].
- [20] P.-M. Ho, Y. Imamura and Y. Matsuo, “M2 to D2 revisited”, arXiv:0805.1202 [hep-th].
- [21] R. Weitzenböck, “Invariantentheorie,” P. Noordhoff, Gröningen, 1923. Ph. Gautheron, “Some remarks concerning Nambu mechanics,” Lett. in Math. Phys. **37** (1996), 103. D. Alekseevsky, P. Guha, “On Decomposability of Nambu-Poisson Tensor,” Acta. Math. Univ. Comenianae **65** (1996), 1. R. Ibáñez, M. de León, J. C. Marrero, D. M. de Diego, “Dynamics of generalized Poisson and Nambu-Poisson brackets,” J. of Math. Physics **38** (1997), 2332. N. Nakanishi, “On Nambu-Poisson Manifolds,” Reviews in Mathematical Physics **10** (1998), 499. G. Marmo, G. Vilasi, A. M. Vinogradov, “The local structure of n-Poisson and n-Jacobi manifolds,” J. Geom. Physics **25** (1998), 141.
- [22] E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin and P. K. Townsend, “Supermembranes and eleven-dimensional supergravity,” Phys. Lett. B **189**, 75 (1987).
- [23] P. Pasti, D. P. Sorokin and M. Tonin, “Covariant action for a D = 11 five-brane with the chiral field,” Phys. Lett. B **398**, 41 (1997) [arXiv:hep-th/9701037]; I. A. Bandos, K. Lechner, A. Nurmagambetov, P. Pasti, D. P. Sorokin and M. Tonin, “Covariant action for the super-five-brane of M-theory,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 4332 (1997) [arXiv:hep-th/9701149].
- [24] M. Aganagic, J. Park, C. Popescu and J. H. Schwarz, “World-volume action of the M-theory five-brane,” Nucl. Phys. B **496**, 191 (1997) [arXiv:hep-th/9701166].
- [25] P.-M. Ho and Y. Matsuo, “M5 from M2,” JHEP **0806** (2008) 105, [arXiv:0804.3629 [hep-th]].
- [26] P.-M. Ho, Y. Imamura, Y. Matsuo and S. Shiba, “M5-brane in three-form flux and multiple M2-brane,” JHEP **0808** (2008) 014, [arXiv:0805.2898 [hep-th]].

- [27] P. M. Ho and Y. Matsuo, “A toy model of open membrane field theory in constant 3-form flux,” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **39**, 913 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0701130].
- [28] O. Aharony, O. Bergman, D. L. Jafferis and J. Maldacena, “N=6 superconformal Chern-Simons-matter theories, M2-branes and their gravity duals,” *JHEP* **0810**, 091 (2008) [arXiv:0806.1218 [hep-th]].
- [29] J. Bagger and N. Lambert, “Three-Algebras and N=6 Chern-Simons Gauge Theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 025002 (2009) [arXiv:0807.0163 [hep-th]].
- [30] S. Terashima and F. Yagi, “M5-brane Solution in ABJM Theory and Three-algebra,” arXiv:0909.3101 [hep-th].